

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,582	04/16/2004	Rolf Pfeifer	3926.081	1763
30448 AKERMAN SE	7590 05/15/200° ENTERFITT		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3188	3		LIN, ING HOUR	
WEST PALM	BEACH, FL 33402-318	38	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			1725	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

V			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/826,582	PFEIFER ET AL.	,
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ing-Hour Lin	1725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with t	ne correspondence addres	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS acause the application to become ABAND	ION. De timely filed  from the mailing date of this commur ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Fe	ebruary 2007.		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the men	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are pending in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		ne Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Of	fice Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		cation No	
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ol>			e
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not rece	eived.	
•	•		
Attachment(s)	🗖		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Linterview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Inform		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)		

Art Unit: 1725

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 21-22, 25-27, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al.

Marcus et al (col. 6 lines 56+) teach the claimed investment casting mold and insert (core) for casting metals including porous ceramic produced by selectively sintering on binder coated ceramic particles, and teach methods of producing a green casting mold by rapid prototyping method including 3D construction using CAD/CAM system and laser beam for sintering a first layer of composite ceramic powders deposited on support plate (target surface), wherein the powder comprising alumina particles coated by polymer binder and finer ammonium

Art Unit: 1725

dihydrogen phosphate having lower sintering temperature. Marcus et al fail to teach the use of resin having relatively high thermal expansion coefficient required for coating the coarse alumina particle.

However, Nagai et al (col. 2, lines 20+) teach the use of bonding or coating resin having relatively high thermal expansion coefficient of (3-10 x 10<sup>-6</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>) and melted silica forming ceramic core layer for the purpose of matching thermal expansion. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Marcus et al the use of bonding or coating resin having relatively high thermal expansion coefficient of (3-10 x 10<sup>-6</sup> K<sup>-1</sup>) forming ceramic core layer as taught by Nagai et al in order to effectively increase thermal expansion coefficient of core and mold for matching metal cast and improving casting quality of precision.

4. Claims 23-24 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al and further in view of either Zoia et al or Smith et al.

Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al fails to teach the use of optimal design including reinforcing ribs and cooling channels and support including back-fed ceramic material.

However, Zoia et al (col. 3, lines 3+) teach the use of optimal design including reinforcing ribs 100 and cooling channels for the purpose of controlling both strength and structure. Smith et al (col.4, lines 10+) teach the support including back-fed ceramic material such as unconsolidated mold 41 formed from alumina for the purpose of supporting the mold during casting. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al the use of optimal design including reinforcing ribs and cooling channels as taught by Zoia et al in order to effectively control both strength and structure

Art Unit: 1725

and the use of support including back-fed ceramic material as taught by Smith et al in order to effectively support the mold during casting.

5. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al and further in view of Kington.

Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al fails to teach the use of matching the coefficient of thermal expansion between the casting mold and the supper alloys to be cast in the mold.

However, Kington (col. 1, lines 43+) teaches the use of matching the coefficient of thermal expansion between the casting mold and the Ni-supper alloys to be cast in the mold for the purpose of preventing porosity in the cast alloys. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Marcus et al in view of Nagai et al the use of matching the coefficient of thermal expansion between the casting mold and the Ni-supper alloys to be cast in the mold as taught by Kington in order to prevent porosity in the cast alloys.

## Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims21-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ing-Hour Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1180. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Pat Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1 sex

I.-H. Lin

5/10/07

KEVIN KERNS

Kerin Kons 5/11/07

Page 5